



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/629,680	07/30/2003	Kristian Hammond	117409-018	6562
24573	7590	03/23/2009	EXAMINER	
K&L Gates LLP P.O. Box 1135 CHICAGO, IL 60690			STACE, BRENT S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2161	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/23/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/629,680	Applicant(s) HAMMOND ET AL.	
	Examiner BRENT STACE	Art Unit 2161	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) BRENT STACE. (3) Jay Budzik.

(2) James F. Goedken. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 19 March 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Budzik.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant argued that unlike the prior art, the inventive system uses adaptive weighting. The examiner suggested to further clarify the adaptive weighting. Applicant proposed amendments such as "frequency of occurrence of the stylistic attribute" to help further clarify. No agreement was reached with respect to the claims.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/BRENT STACE/ Examiner, Art Unit 2161	/Apu M Mofiz/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2161
--	---